

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

JAN 29 1986

**1900**<sup>th</sup> MEETING: 26 MARCH 1976

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1900) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Complaint by Kenya, on behalf of the African Group of States at the United Nations, concerning the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola: Letter dated 10 March 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Kenya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12007) .....	1

YHARSHI MU

W. P. S. PAE

#### NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## 1900th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 26 March 1976, at 5 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Thomas S. BOYA (Benin).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Benin, China, France, Guyana, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1900)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Complaint by Kenya, on behalf of the African Group of States at the United Nations, concerning the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola:  
Letter dated 10 March 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Kenya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12007).

*The meeting was called to order at 6.05 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

**Complaint by Kenya, on behalf of the African Group of States at the United Nations, concerning the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the people's Republic of Angola:**

Letter dated 10 March 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Kenya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12007)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I wish to inform Council members that the Secretary-General has received a letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Angola, dated 24 March, which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to inform you that Pascal Luvualu, member of the Central Committee of the MPLA [*Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola*] and Ambassador-at-Large of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Angola, is the envoy of my Government and has been instructed to take part in the discussions on Angola to take place in the Security Council. May

I therefore request you to grant him the necessary facilities for the performance of his mission and to accept the expression of my highest regard."

2. May I draw the attention of Council members to the provisions of Article 32 of the Charter, which states that:

"... any state which is not a Member of the United Nations, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute. The Security Council shall lay down such conditions as it deems just for the participation of a state which is not a Member of the United Nations."

3. In view of the nature of the matter which is on the agenda, and in view of the contents of the letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola, I propose to invite the representative of Angola to participate in the Council's debate.

*It was so decided.*

4. Mr. SCRANTON (United States of America): I wish to state for the record that my Government has agreed to the participation in this debate of representatives of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola on the customary understanding that such agreement in no way constitutes an act of recognition.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Luvualu, representative of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Angola, took a place at the Council table.*

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should also like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the Permanent Representatives of Cuba, Egypt, Guinea, Kenya, Madagascar, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Zambia in which they request to be invited, in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. If there are no objections, and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite those representatives, in accordance with the usual practice of the Council and the relevant provisions of the Charter, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

6. There being no objection, I invite these representatives to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mrs. Jeanne Martin Cissé (Guinea), Mr. Maina (Kenya), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Harriman (Nigeria), Mr. Blyden (Sierra Leone), Mr. Hussien (Somalia) and Mr. Kamana (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

7. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to draw the Council's attention to the following documents: S/12019 and Add.1, S/12023 and S/12024.

8. The first speaker is the representative of Angola, on whom I now call.

9. Mr. LUVUALU (Angola) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation appreciates the decision of the Security Council to allow us to address it on a subject of great and urgent importance for Angola. We are particularly pleased that on this occasion the Council's debate is taking place under your guidance, Mr. President.

10. I wish to transmit to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, an expression of our gratitude for the sustained interest that he has shown in Angola and for his tireless efforts in the quest for world peace.

11. On behalf of the Angolan people, the Central Committee of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola and the Government of the People's Republic of Angola, I greet the members of the Security Council, and in so doing, I recall the time when our country was still under colonial domination and remember the favorable disposition of the Council in support and defence of the heroic struggle of the Angolan people.

12. I wish also here and now to thank the African countries for taking the initiative in calling this meeting of the Council, in conformity with the recommendation expressed by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at its last meeting.

13. In its decolonization and indeed in its independence Angola has gone through and is still experiencing a difficult period. After the first war of national liberation, which lasted for about 15 years, when the Angolan people were counting on achieving independence in a climate of peace, a plot was hatched behind the scenes by the imperialists the purpose of which was to create in our country a neo-colonial situation.

14. While it was still under the so-called government of transition, our country was the victim of the most unjustified invasion. And even Portugal, which at that time was still claiming for itself the exercise of sovereignty in Angola, remained strangely silent about what was happening in Angola, as did a good portion of world public opinion.

15. Imperialism, having concluded that it was not enough to create and to arm puppet groups among their lackeys, sent into our country not only mercenaries of diverse nationalities, but also the regular South African army. It is fitting here to stress that that invasion took place at the exact moment when the puppet armies had been all but defeated and the MPLA, the vanguard of the Angolan people, already controlled most of the country. The purpose was then to offset the failures of the internal agents of imperialism, to cut off the vanguard of the Angolan people and to prevent the declaration of independence scheduled for 11 November 1975.

16. We shall not level any accusations at individual countries nor endeavour to expose the various motives which underlay that invasion, but we shall demand that South African forces withdraw immediately from our country. We are demanding that because at the present time not only is our sovereignty being violated on our southern boundary, but also there are violations of principles universally recognized by the international community.

17. The People's Republic of Angola is an independent and sovereign country. The main features of our foreign policy which should be made clear here may be found in the declaration of independence and in the constitutional law. The People's Republic of Angola respects the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, and will establish relations of friendship and co-operation with all States on the basis of the principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, of equality, non-interference in the internal affairs of all countries and of mutual benefit. The People's Republic of Angola belongs to no international military bloc nor does it allow foreign military bases to be established on its national territory.

18. Because we defend those principles, we have been struck by the fact that certain circles in international politics have been concerned about Soviet and Cuban support for our country. It is regrettable that, when the South African invasion had apparently succeeded, those same voices remained silent, and it was only later, after 11 November, with the independence of Angola, that we were accused of using the assistance of friendly countries to drive out the invader. In reality, we exercise our sovereignty by asking for assistance from those who since the beginning have had a better understanding of our struggle. We must say that it is ridiculous to speak in terms of Soviet and Cuban interference in Angola,

because we know that that assistance is not part of any expansionist policy, nor is it a violation of our sovereignty. Such allegations are ridiculous also because we know that elsewhere in the word the very countries that speak against us practise expansionism and neo-colonialism and occupy certain territories. And the very country that has invaded us uses Namibia, which it illegally occupies. Where is the consistency of those who, while proclaiming peace, support the oppression of peoples by maintaining a state of war?

19. We are an independent and sovereign country. We have a right to appeal to any country to help us when we believe it to be necessary. We should like to make it abundantly clear here that any concern of this kind about our country is unquestionably an unjustified interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola. We vigorously reject that interference, just as our people have vigorously rejected the enemies of our country in their courageous struggle for freedom.

20. In this connexion we cannot but thank those who have helped us in our fight against imperialism, in particular the African countries, the socialist countries, and other progressive forces throughout the world.

21. Fortunately, the Security Council is meeting during a period when matters in southern Africa are growing clearer and coming to a head. After the undeniable victory of the Angolan people over the South African army, we now witness violations of the same kind being perpetrated by the racist régime of Rhodesia against the People's Republic of Mozambique. For that reason, the Council must take a firm, clear stand on the subject to ensure that such actions are not repeated, as they would endanger peace and security in the southern part of the African continent with all the consequences that could follow.

22. It is not the situation in Angola which gives rise to concern regarding peace; it is the situation in Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. Consequently the Angolan people stand together with the peoples of those countries in their struggle, and we are convinced that the hour of freedom is at hand.

23. As far as we are concerned, if South Africa had obeyed the recommendations of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity, the Namibian question would be settled and nothing out of the ordinary would have occurred on our southern boundary.

24. During its invasion, South Africa used sophisticated *matériel* the origin of which is well known. We intend to give examples to remove any ambiguity. We might mention the following: 72 AML-90 tanks, 18 AML-60 tanks, 140 mm guns, 88 and 105 mm shells, 106 and 107 mm mortars, 106 and 90 mm guns, AD "ENTAC" installations, and so on.

25. During those incursions, South African forces suffered heavy losses, and many prisoners fell into the hands of FAPLA [*Popular Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola*]. Those prisoners have been presented to the press on a number of occasions. They are in Angola, and they have not been mistreated, because the People's Republic of Angola respects international conventions on the subject.

26. The South African invasion caused great loss to the Angolan people and to the People's Republic of Angola. Aside from the barbaric massacres they committed among the civilian population, South Africans carried off with them goods essential to our economy, namely, a considerable part of our fleet, small aircraft, trucks, thousands of prime quality cattle, household and hotel furniture, and money from banks. They destroyed and damaged roads, bridges, airports, industrial units and radio-broadcasting stations. They also took thousands of individuals with them to the Namibian border.

27. Yet we have been accused of wanting to annex Namibia, of wanting to deprive the people of Namibia of water and electricity. That is entirely false. Angola is a large country; it is sufficient for the Angolan people and for the foreigners who wish to live there. It is hardly our intention to deprive the people of Namibia of the electricity from the Cunene or of the water they need. We stress that we have no common boundary with South Africa but we have with the people of Namibia, and when that people gains its independence, the People's Republic of Angola may in due course discuss with it, on a mutually acceptable basis, the problem of the use of electricity and water from the Cunene. That is our approach to the problem now. We are not expansionist or selfish.

28. We therefore expect the international community, the United Nations and its specialized agencies to provide us with the necessary aid and assistance so that our country may get down to the task of national reconstruction.

29. Recent statements by the authorities in Pretoria notwithstanding—they have said that they will abandon or have abandoned the Cunene—we repeat here our position, namely, that we demand the unconditional withdrawal of the forces of the South African army, and we express the hope that the Security Council will take a decision so that that withdrawal may be verified immediately.

30. We also hope that the Council will take action to see to it that South Africa guarantees respect for the independence and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola, that it stops using the Territory of Namibia as a base for acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and that it returns material property to the People's Republic of Angola and compensates Angola for damages to its economy and people.

31. Finally, we express the hope that we shall be admitted to membership of the United Nations as soon as possible so that we may make a contribution to the consolidation of peace in the world by joining all those progressive forces that are already part of the United Nations.

32. Ours is a sovereign, independent country. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss South African aggression, and it is our earnest hope that the entire discussion will focus on that problem rather than on anything unrelated to the interests of the Angolan people.

33. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Kenya has requested to be allowed to take part in the debate in his capacity as current Chairman of the African Group. I now invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

34. Mr. MAINA (Kenya): Mr. President, allow me to thank you and the members of the Council for inviting me to take part in the discussion of the question of South Africa's aggression in Angola. Before I proceed any further I should like also to welcome among us the Permanent Representative of the United States, this being the first time I have spoken since he assumed his duties. I am quite sure he will make a contribution in the work of the Council and of the United Nations as a whole.

35. Mr. President, when I wrote to you in my capacity as Chairman of the African Group for the month of March, requesting you to convene this meeting, it was our intention that the debate should take place as soon as possible. Various factors have combined to delay this meeting, the most important of which was that we were awaiting the arrival of the delegation of the People's Republic of Angola. I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the African Group, to welcome here the delegation from Angola. Mr. Luvualu arrived only yesterday, and I know how busy he has been since his arrival preparing for this meeting. The statement he made has clarified many important questions that have been exercising our minds for some time now. His statement has very ably focused our attention on the issue before the Council, and it is my belief that this will make our discussion of the problem much easier. I congratulate him on the able manner in which he has presented the case of the People's Republic of Angola against the Republic of South Africa, which has perpetrated an unprovoked aggression against Angola.

36. Before I go any further, I should like to request the Council through you, Mr. President, to recall the number of occasions when, in the course of discussion on problems unrelated to Angola, representatives in this Council have taken the opportunity to raise the question of Angola, thereby raising a very serious issue in a completely wrong context and at times

causing statements to be made which one would have liked to avoid.

37. On behalf of the African Group, I should like to take this opportunity at the outset to appeal to all friends of Africa to respect the People's Republic of Angola and the specific case and the issues that the delegation of Angola has raised by restricting their contribution to the debate to the specific questions before the Council.

38. I make this request now, because last week some delegations, which I need not name, promised publicly in the Council that they would take the opportunity provided by this debate to raise questions which we have reason to believe, judging by the experience of the last few weeks, will have only remote relevance to this debate and, if our appeal is not heeded, may easily damage the cause which should be served by this debate.

39. The case of aggression by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola is well known and has been the subject of numerous communications which have been brought to the attention of this Council. The People's Republic of Angola raised the question with the Organization of African Unity some time ago. The OAU Council of Ministers discussed the question in February and adopted a resolution which, *inter alia*, requested the African Group, which I represent here now, to call for an emergency meeting of the Security Council to consider the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola. It is on the basis of that request that I wrote to you, Mr. President, to call for this meeting.

40. In the meantime we have all seen the letter from the representative of South Africa contained in document S/12019, in which it is claimed by the highest authorities in South Africa that in some way South Africa had some justification for its aggression. In order to put these matters straight, to have the facts on record and to show the type of authority we are dealing with, I intend to read the statement made by the Prime Minister of South Africa contained in annex I of that document. It reads as follows:

"It will be recalled that on 9 August 1975 while the Portuguese were still legally responsible for and were in fact the governing power in Angola, South Africa was, because of the complete breakdown of law and order, forced to occupy the Calueque Dam site. We did this solely for the purpose of protecting the lives of the workers and of safeguarding the installations.

"Immediately thereafter, the South African Government informed the Portuguese Government of the steps taken and urged them to take over this task. The Portuguese Government could not do so at the time and requested South Africa to continue

its protective measures and to remain *in situ* until such time as they could assume this responsibility.

"The South African Government has on a number of occasions stated its position clearly, namely that it was there only for the protection of the workers and the works and would withdraw from the area as soon as assurances were received that no harm would come to the workers, that the work would continue and that the flow of water to Owambo would be assured. It will be recalled that the Minister of Defence, ..., the Minister for Foreign Affairs, as well as myself, clearly stated South Africa's position. As recently as Sunday, 14 March, I outlined our position succinctly in an interview with *The Sunday Telegraph* of London. I stated that:

'they asked us to hang on until such time as they could do it. They never came. So it is solely for that reason and not for any ulterior motives that we are still there.'

'We will withdraw our troops immediately steps are taken to safeguard lives and property; the moment that is done we will get out.'

"We have during the past few days received, through a third party, assurances which in general terms appear to be acceptable to us. We are checking whether we are interpreting these assurances correctly, and if this is so, South Africa will withdraw its troops also from the Calueque area not later than 27 March."

41. No better comment can be made on this false claim than to read the response of the representative of Portugal contained in document S/12023, from which I quote:

"Annex I of the above-mentioned letter contains a statement made by the Prime Minister of the Republic of South Africa, Mr. B. J. Vorster, on 21 March, regarding the question of withdrawal of South African troops from the area of the Calueque dam, in Angola.

"In a portion of this statement, the Prime Minister of South Africa affirms that his country's troops occupied the Calueque dam site as of August 1975, with the alleged purpose 'of protecting the lives of the workers and of safeguarding the installations', having immediately informed the Portuguese Government of that fact and urging them to take over that task. Mr. Vorster adds that 'the Portuguese Government could not do so at the time and requested South Africa to continue its protective measures and to remain *in situ* until such time as they could assume this responsibility'.

"It must not fail to be noted that, contrary to what was stated by the Defence Minister of South Africa, in November 1975, Mr. Vorster now admits

that his country's troops penetrated Angolan territory on 9 August 1975, with neither the knowledge nor the advance authorization of the Portuguese Government, which only became aware of that action after it had already taken place.

"As a matter of fact, on 12 August, the Ambassador of Portugal in Pretoria was called to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of South Africa and informed that a South African military force had been sent to Calueque. Later on that occasion, the Portuguese Ambassador protested against that territorial violation.

"On 18 August, these protests were repeated in Lisbon to the South African Ambassador, who had been called for that purpose to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. They were again reiterated in a note addressed to him on 3 September.

"Consequently, the affirmation that the Portuguese Government had asked South Africa to remain in the Calueque area and to continue to assume the safety of work in progress at the dam, is completely without foundation.

"My Government gave no advance authorization to the Government of South Africa to undertake such action and did not fail to protest, once it became aware of it."

42. By South Africa's own admission it is guilty of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, and the attempt to justify that aggression has been frustrated by the authoritative response of the representative of Portugal. A number of issues arise from this situation. First, South Africa was guilty of aggression against the Portuguese oppressed colony of Angola at the time when the Portuguese Government was making arrangements for the transfer of power to Angola. That must have contributed a great deal to the troubles of the Republic of Angola, not to mention those of the Portuguese authorities. That aggression has continued for all this time without any justification. We cannot do any less than to ask the Council to condemn that aggression.

43. We have to remember that South Africa has no common border with the People's Republic of Angola. South Africa moved many hundreds of miles from its borders through Namibia, which it occupies illegally, before reaching Angolan territory. We have been saying for a long time that South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia constitutes a threat to international peace and security. This has been demonstrated in a shameless way by South Africa. It has no business to be in Namibia and, as though that is not bad enough, has moved beyond to commit acts of aggression and destruction in the People's Republic of Angola. We can do no less than to ask the Council to condemn the racist régime of South Africa for using Namibia for aggressive purposes against the People's Republic of Angola.

44. A long list of crimes committed by the Republic of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola has been given by the representative of Angola. The destruction of human life, including the lives of men, women and children not involved in war, cannot be tolerated by the United Nations. The destruction of property, as described by the representative of Angola, is also incompatible with the false grounds given by South Africa for its aggression in the first place. We urge this Council to demand that South Africa compensate the People's Republic of Angola for all the destruction it has committed in Angola.

45. Regarding the assurances which South Africa claims to need and to have obtained that the People's Republic of Angola will safeguard lives and property in Angola, I am bound to comment that, were we not engaged in discussing a serious matter of aggression, I would be tempted to laugh. Angola is a large territory with many people and a lot of resources and property. The South African Government would have the world believe that whatever claims it may have somewhere in Angola are either more important or valuable than everybody and everything else in Angola and that the Government of Angola, which has the responsibility of safeguarding the lives and property of millions of people, should give an assurance that it will not destroy what is, truly, Angola's property. These claims should be treated with the contempt they deserve.

46. As I stated earlier, it is a well-known fact that South Africa has no common border with Angola, and Angola would have no grounds for giving an assurance about boundaries to a Government that dominates Namibia illegally. If the United Nations wishes to obtain some assurance regarding Namibian borders with Angola, the United Nations Council for Namibia would be the right authority. It would be an absurd situation were this Council to countenance a situation in which South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia is given official notice through discussions in the Council. The Council has a straightforward duty to call once more upon South Africa to vacate Namibia as soon as possible.

47. Although this debate should be confined to the question of South Africa's aggression in Angola, as I said before, the Council has a duty to restate clearly its position on the question of South Africa's use of Namibia's territory as a base for committing aggression against Angola.

48. Looking at the whole situation, we see that the issues before the Council are clear and straightforward, and it is our earnest hope that the Council will see them as such and make its position clear. To those who have been engaged in debating outside this chamber issues that have no relevance to the continent of Africa, we say that if you want to safeguard peace and security in that part of the world you should change the soiled glasses through which you look at the African

continent. Wear clean ones; adjust your position so that you can see the continent the way the African sees it. If you do not do this, you are bound to continue to base your assessment of the problems facing the African people on wrong premises, and wrong decisions and actions are bound to follow.

49. To us in Africa the issues are clear. We have stated them many times and we have no grounds for repeating them here. Since the question of aggression by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola is simple and clear, we appeal to the Council to pronounce its position by adopting a suitable resolution when the time comes.

50. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to inform the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Yugoslavia in which he requests to be invited, pursuant to Article 31 of the Charter, to participate without the right to vote in the discussion. If I hear no objection I propose, in accordance with the usual practice of the Council under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to invite him to participate without the right to vote in the debate.

51. There being no objection, I invite the representative of Yugoslavia to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is his turn to speak.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Petric (Yugoslavia) took a place at the side of the Council chamber.*

52. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has listened attentively to the statements made by the previous speakers.

53. At present the development of the Angolan situation has caused great concern and drawn close attention from people all over the world. The Chinese delegation would like to make some observations on it.

54. The Angolan people, who carried on the struggle for national liberation, at long last solemnly proclaimed their independence on 11 November 1975. This is a great victory won by the broad masses of the Angolan people, who have persevered in protracted and courageous struggles against Portuguese colonialists, particularly the armed struggle which was started by various Angolan liberation organizations in the 1960's with the co-ordination and support of the people of Africa and the rest of the world who are vigorously carrying on struggles against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. On this the Chinese Government has extended its warm congratulations to the Angolan people and all the Angolan liberation organizations.

55. However, when the victory of the national liberation struggle in Angola was won, the Soviet social-

imperialists crossed the oceans, committed naked armed intervention and plunged the newly independent young State of Angola into painful division and civil war. The South African racist régime, which has always harboured wild ambitions of aggression and expansion, also openly carried out armed aggression against Angola and directly interfered in its internal affairs under the pretext of protecting its so-called interests in Angola. This is of course extremely absurd. It must be pointed out that the serious situation in Angola was created by the fierce contention between the two hegemonic Powers. The event in Angola is a serious one which has never happened in the history of the African national liberation movement since the Second World War. Its seriousness lies not only in the fact that the South African racist régime attempts to obstruct the victorious advance of the national liberation movement in southern Africa so as continuously to maintain its reactionary rule; what merits further attention is that to contend with the other super-Power for world hegemony, the super-Power which flaunts the flag of socialism pushes feverishly its colonial policy of expansion and scrambles for strategically important places in southern Africa. Such a frenzied offensive by Soviet social-imperialism is bound to bring extremely serious consequences to Angola, southern Africa and even the whole African continent.

56. The Chinese Government and people strongly condemn the South African authorities for their crimes of armed aggression and intervention in Angola. We firmly support the people of Angola and the rest of Africa in opposing the aggression by South Africa in Angola and demanding its immediate and complete withdrawal therefrom. This position of the African people is entirely just. Meanwhile, the Chinese Government and people strongly condemn Soviet social-imperialism for its aggression and intervention in Angola and firmly hold that the Soviet military personnel and its foreign mercenary troops should immediately and completely withdraw from Angola. This is also a just demand of just public opinion and the Governments of many countries in the world.

57. Now, because of the stern condemnation and resolute struggles of the Angolan people, the African peoples and the people throughout the world, the South African racist régime was forced to declare the complete withdrawal of its aggressor troops in Angola on 27 March. Whether this can become a reality still remains to be seen. However, some 1,000 Soviet military personnel and over 10,000 foreign mercenary troops supported by the Soviet Union are still hanging on in Angola and refuse to withdraw. Since Soviet social-imperialism got the upper hand in Angola, it has been hatching new schemes of aggression and expansion. The Security Council cannot evade such a serious state of affairs, still less condone it.

58. The aggression and intervention by Soviet social-imperialism in Angola is by no means an accidental

and isolated event. It is the continuation of its ceaseless aggression and expansion abroad over the last decade and more. This constitutes a component part of its quest for South Atlantic and world hegemony in contention with the other super-Power, as well as an important disposition for realizing its global offensive strategy. It wormed its way into the Middle East, invaded and occupied Czechoslovakia, stirred up conflicts in the South Asian subcontinent, subsequently thrust itself into Portugal and now has laid hands on Angola in southern Africa.

59. Soviet social-imperialism supported one of the three Angolan liberation organizations against the other two, deliberately created division and time and again undermined the joint agreements and cease-fire agreements among the three liberation organizations, and it alone wrecked the transitional government which was a symbol of Angolan national unity. The Soviet Union never extended any real support to the Angolan people during their protracted and courageous struggle to free themselves from the Portuguese colonial rule, but right after the collapse of the old colonial rule and the attainment of independence by the Angolan people, the Soviet Union became most generous by sending a great amount of such weapons as tanks, rockets, armoured cars, fighter bombers of the latest type etc., with a value of several hundred million dollars, dispatching some 1,000 Soviet military officers and shipping over 10,000 foreign mercenary troops to stir up and directly join the civil war there. As a result, 150,000 black brothers in Angola were killed with the Soviet weapons and many towns and villages were razed to the ground by the Soviet bombs. Can a real socialist country do a thing like this? The towering crimes committed by this super-Power in Angola constitute a big exposure of the policy of expansion it pursues, as well as new evidence of the ambitious new tsars' feverish bid for world hegemony.

60. To cover up their true feature of aggression and expansion the Soviet social-imperialists have boasted about their consistent "sincere and selfless support for the national liberation movement", styled themselves "the natural ally" of the national liberation movement, and described their intervention, control and expansion as the fulfilment of "internationalist duties". However, the facts have proved all this to be sheer deception.

61. As we may recall, when the Cambodian people carried on arduous struggles to punish the Lon Nol traitorous clique, the Soviet Union had all along refused to recognize the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia and instead maintained diplomatic relations with the Lon Nol traitorous clique.

62. To fight against the Israeli Zionist aggression the Egyptian people have been carrying on prolonged and courageous struggles. But taking advantage of the Egyptian people's aspirations to resist aggression, the Soviet Union, through providing the so-called military

and economic "aid", has carried out infiltration, exacted military bases and various privileges and fostered pro-Soviet forces in Egypt in an attempt to make Egypt a Soviet dependency. Furthermore, the Soviet Union withheld the shipment of munitions and spare parts, ferociously pressed for payment of debts, sowed discord among Arab countries and even went so far as to conspire to subvert the Egyptian Government and undermine Egypt's struggle against aggression. President Sadat therefore had to expel the 14,000 Soviet military personnel in 1972 and not long ago firmly announced the termination of the "Treaty of friendship and co-operation" with the Soviet Union. The just action taken by President Sadat to safeguard the national independence and State sovereignty of Egypt has won the support and praise of the Egyptian people, the other Arab peoples and justice-upholding countries and peoples throughout the world.

63. Have not the above-mentioned examples fully revealed the true features of the Soviet Union as sham socialism and real imperialism?

64. The Soviet social-imperialists have repeatedly declared that they do not seek anything in Angola, either economic, military or other gain. This is likewise sheer deception. For a long time the Soviet propaganda machine has openly talked of the "envious natural resources in Angola" and Angola's "extremely important strategic position". Their attempt is to seize naval and air bases in Angola with a view to dominating the southern Atlantic. They also intend to make Angola a springboard for expansion in central and southern Africa, and further undermine the national liberation movements in all of southern Africa and grab the region's strategic resources. If one links their activities in trying so hard to establish new bridge-heads in the regions of the Suez Canal and the mouth of the Red Sea with their activities in seeking footholds in the western Mediterranean, will one not be able to see clearly the reason why they have been acting undisguisedly and without counting costs?

65. What the Soviet social-imperialists have done in Angola greatly widens one's horizon and tells people that the Soviet leading clique, which has honey on its lips and murder in its heart, is not a natural ally at all but is a group of vicious new tsars. It also tells people that if the Soviet social-imperialists are allowed to do evil in Angola and realize their designs, it is hard to say that there will not be a second or even a third Angola. Until the Soviet social-imperialists' intervention is done away with, there can be no peace or tranquillity in Angola and in the continent of Africa.

66. Soviet social-imperialism has wild ambitions but lacks strength, and its difficulties abound. Wherever it commits aggression and expansion, it puts a new noose around its neck. It can deceive people and run amuck at a certain time, but it will certainly meet with ignominious defeat. We are deeply convinced that the great African people, who have stood up, will

certainly do away with super-Power aggression and interference, close their ranks, heighten their vigilance, distinguish the true from the false and friend from foe, and push the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, hegemonism, white racism and zionism ahead to a new victorious stage.

67. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before calling on the next speaker I should like to make the following clarification. First, I would like to read out the agenda item again: "Complaint by Kenya, on behalf of the African Group of States at the United Nations, concerning the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola". I should like to remind members of the Council of the wish of the representative of Angola that we limit ourselves strictly to the item on the agenda. I would recall also the request made by the representative of Kenya. Having done that, I would express the desire that statements by members of the Council not depart from the specific request of the African Group of States. I solemnly appeal to all the members of the Security Council to respect the wish of the representatives of Angola and the African Group.

68. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Today the Security Council is discussing the complaint by Kenya, on behalf of the African Group of States at the United Nations, concerning the act of aggression committed by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola. I fully agree that we should limit ourselves to that subject. Everything that I have just heard has been so stupid that I do not intend to reply. I shall accede to the request of the African countries and adhere to the subject for the discussion of which we are meeting. But I do reserve my right to reply later on to all this stupidity that we have just heard.

69. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): I have very reluctantly asked to speak. I have done so in exercise of my full responsibility as representative of an African State member of the Council, an African State whose Government and people maintain the best of relations with the People's Republic of China and also with the Soviet Union.

70. In the past—I have been here for almost six years, and although that is not too long a time, it is long enough to know this—there have been a good number of exchanges in the Organization between the delegation of China and the delegation of the Soviet Union. I have always, advisedly and I think wisely, remained quiet. I intend to do so in the future. For it would be the height of naïveté on my part to intervene in such cases; those who indulge in these exchanges have their own reasons for doing so.

71. But it so happens that today we are discussing an African problem, a request made by the African Group at the specific direction of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity. There-

fore, the African members of this Council have a particular responsibility to defend Africa's interests and to project Africa's position properly.

72. I had intended to speak only to join in the appeal made by the President of the Council, either in his capacity as President or in his capacity as representative of an African State, that the Council confine the scope of its discussion to the item on the agenda. I want to assure you, Mr. President, that you have my fullest understanding and sympathy; I know, from the limited experience I have had in the Council that it is not possible to prevent, or even to attempt to prevent, any member of the Council from saying what he desires or what he deems fit.

73. But I think we have the right also to insist that the rights of the African States and their conception of the problem be taken seriously into account when members of the Council address themselves to a problem brought up by the African States. More specifically, I believe that since it is a privilege of every member of the Council and, for that matter, of any Member of the United Nations, to ask for the consideration of a given problem, it is only logical that, when that problem is being considered, members should address themselves to it. Therefore, in supporting the appeal made by the President of the Council, I should like to point out that if our colleagues wish to discuss other matters apart from South Africa's aggression against Angola, they are, of course, free and entitled to demand a consideration of those matters. But I think, to put it mildly, it would be unfortunate and indeed sad for us if, when discussing what to Africa is a very serious problem—the problem of South Africa's aggression against Angola—we were to hijack the debate from the consideration of the real problem and divert it to other problems which in the conception of other members of the Council may be important.

74. Therefore, in a nutshell, what I am saying is that if some of our colleagues in the Council wish to discuss other aspects, they are entitled to ask for their specific inscriptions on the agenda so that it may consider them. When they do so, of course, the question of whether such discussion is in violation of the principle of the rights of nations in relation to the internal affairs of Members of the Organization will be judged as the problem arises. But I really appeal for members to make a deliberate effort, if it is not possible to refrain completely from making other comments, not to be so swept away by other problems as to forget the havoc, the damage, the devastation which the South Africans have been inflicting on our brothers in Angola.

75. I also for the first time wish to take issue with the statement made by the representative of China, only to say that we do not accept and we shall never accept the thesis that the South African aggression in Angola was caused by Soviet support, Cuban support,

or any other support for the liberation movement in Angola. Clearly, as the representative of Angola has rightly pointed out, the South Africans have committed aggression against Angola, and I think that if one takes the trouble of going through the documents and following the chronology of events one would come to the conclusion that the South Africans committed aggression and, as rightly pointed out by our colleague from Angola, the Government of Angola requested assistance.

76. Now, one can have his own views on the merits and demerits of the request made by Angola; one can even question whether the Government of Angola had the right to ask for any assistance. This is a matter on which every Government and every representative has the right to make his own views known. But I think it would not be fair to accept the thesis that the South Africans had any justification, no matter how disguised the justification, for the aggression against Angola. We reject this for a number of reasons, not merely in the interests of Angola, its independence and its sovereignty; we who come, as I do, from that part of the world, do so more for our own survival. We do not accept, we shall not accept—and I think we would be naïve to accept that the South Africans can have any legitimate or illegitimate—excuse for intervening massively, as they did in the case of Angola, simply because in their conception their interests had been threatened by the incursion or by the support of an extracontinental Power.

77. I say this very forcefully, because it is a matter of record that in the liberation struggle in Africa the countries which have been foremost in giving support to the liberation struggle have been the socialist countries—the Chinese and the Soviets in particular. These are the countries which have supported and are supporting the liberation struggle and have provided equipment. And it is no secret that they are providing assistance, whether military or otherwise. We even had occasion in the past to say that we would welcome it if our American and our British colleagues, as well as our other Western European colleagues, if they were in a position to do so, also provided equipment and material for the liberation struggle. But as things have stood so far, the countries which have lent support and have given material assistance, be it in the form of armaments, equipment on logistics, have been the socialist countries, and I emphasize principally the Chinese and the Soviets.

78. Now, if one could by any stretch of the imagination accept that the South Africans, because of the support received by MPLA from extracontinental Powers, had an excuse to get into Angola, then I must submit that we are preparing the grounds for our own self-destruction, because, as members of the Council are aware, one of the by-products of South Africa's debacle in Angola has been the enactment of spurious, monstrous legislation empowering the South African army to move whenever it feels its interests affected.

Thus, by the logic of the situation, it is quite conceivable that, if in the interpretation and conception of the South African racists—and we all know how twisted South African logic can be—the support given to the liberation movement in southern Africa is such that it threatens their interests, they might feel they have a right to intervene. That is a very serious proposition. Furthermore, if because of the support given by the socialist countries, be they Chinese or Soviet, to African States, or because of the so-called anti-communist campaign, of which they are supposed to be the champions, the South Africans should feel that they are so threatened as to be entitled to move their forces up, then we are in a serious situation. So I repeat: We do not accept that the South African intervention in Angola was the result of the support given to the liberation movement in Angola by extra-continental Powers.

79. The South African aggression in Angola was premeditated. It is characteristic of the racist régime in South Africa to survive by committing aggression against its people from within and by committing aggression against the African States from without. History teaches us that, in the case of the southern African situation, long before the problem of Angola arose the South African forces were operating in

concert with the Portuguese forces in Mozambique against FRELIMO [*Front for the Liberation of Mozambique*]. History teaches us that, long before the issue of Angola emerged, the South African forces were introduced into Zimbabwe, fighting against the freedom fighters there. History, and recent history at that, teaches us that, long before the issue of ideological or cold-war confrontations was brought to the fore—I refer to the current cold-war confrontations—the South Africans committed naked aggression against the Republic of Zambia. Therefore, the South Africans had no justification and were not looking for justification. They are in a sense an aggressive régime, and they will continue to be an aggressive régime unless the international community takes the necessary measures to ensure that they do not proceed on such a course of action.

80. I said that I had to say this, and I do so with full responsibility and full solemnity. I say it as the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, a responsible member of the Council, a loyal member of the African Group and a Member of the Organization.

*The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.*